

Appl. No. 09/826,709
Reply dated May 5, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed February 13, 2004

REMARKS

The present application and its claims are directed to a method and apparatus for the automatic conversion of an electronic mail into an internet web site. In this application, Claims 1, 9, 15, 24 and 31 have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, Claims 39-43 have been added so that Claims 1- 43 are currently pending.

OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended the Abstract.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In response to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13-17, 19-27, 29-33 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 to Davis et al. (hereinafter "Davis") and the rejection of Claims 4, 7, 12, 18, 28 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Davis, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons set forth below and submits that the claims are allowable over Davis.

Claims 1, 9, 15, 24 and 31

Each of the independent claims (Claims 1, 9, 15, 24 and 31) recite (in slightly different forms) that a new site is created at the created unique uniform resource locator based on the electronic mail. The Examiner has cited Davis to support her rejection of the claims. However, Davis does not disclose or suggest that a new site is automatically generated based on an electronic message and its content. Davis does describe that the contents of an existing web page (on a specialized existing RPM web site) may be changed/updated via electronic mail. See Title of Davis and Col. 2, lines 36-55. For example, as shown in Figure 14B, element 94 is an <RPM> markup tag that is positioned within the HTML source file 92 of an existing web page at the location where incoming Web page content changes are to be positioned. See Col. 16, lines 58 – 60. Figure 14A shows an e-mail message 90 that is configured to transmit content changes to an existing Web page. See Col. 16, lines 34 – 41. Figures 14C-1 and 14C-2 show the results of the insertion of the content (contained in the e-mail in Figure 14A) into the HTML source file 92 (shown in Figure 14B) that results in a modified existing web page as shown in Figures 14D-1 and 14D-2. See Col. 16, lines 63-7. Thus, the system in Davis permits the user to transmit content changes for an existing Web page via e-mail. However, the transmission of content changes using a markup tag on an existing site and an e-mail as set forth in Davis is not analogous to the claimed method for generating a new

Appl. No. 09/826,709
Reply dated May 5, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed February 13, 2004

site at a new uniform resource locator based on the electronic message. In particular, the claimed feature permits a user, with no knowledge of HTML code or technology, to generate a new site based on the contents of the electronic message which is not feasible/possible using the system set forth in Davis. For example, a user may attach a plurality of digital photographs to an electronic message and the system creates a new uniform resource locator (URL) and then creates a new site at the URL that contains the digital photograph. The Davis system does not permit the user to create a new site. Thus, Davis does not disclose the claimed invention as set forth in the independent claims.

Furthermore, Davis teaches away from a system that create a new site based on an electronic message and thus does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, Davis distinguishes his Web page modification technology from a variety of known Web site creation and editor tools so that he clearly does not view his invention as a web site creation tool. See Col. 2, lines 11-15. Davis also specifically discloses that his system that updates/changes the content within a Web page does so without granting access to delete, copy, move or rename files and directories on the server hosting the Web pages which he views as a security feature. See Col. 2, lines 48-51 and Col. 3, line 65 – Col. 4, line 5. In contrast, the claimed invention specifically permits a new site creation while limiting the security concerns raised by Davis. Thus, Davis clearly teaches away from the claimed invention of generating a new site based on an electronic message and therefore does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Thus, Claims 1, 9, 15, 24 and 31 are allowable over Davis.

Claims 2-8, 10-14, 16-23, 25- 30 and 32- 38

These claims are allowable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend. Therefore, Claims 2-8, 10-14, 16-23, 25- 30 and 32- 38 are allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

New Claims 39 - 43

Each of these new claims recite “reading a TO field of the electronic mail that contains a post command to create the site. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Davis. In particular, as shown in Figure 14A, the TO field 90a of the Davis message contains the site address of the Web server (the RPM server in the example in Davis) that will process the content changes for the targeted Web page. See Col. 16, lines 38 – 41. Thus, the TO field in Davis does not contain any command since the Davis system does not need a command as the only function

Appl. No. 09/826,709
Reply dated May 5, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed February 13, 2004

for the Davis system is to modify the content of a web page. In contrast, the claimed system contains a command, such as a post command to create the new site. Thus, Davis does not disclose or suggest that the TO field of the address contains a command. Therefore, Claims 39 – 43 are allowable over Davis.

Appl. No. 09/826,709
Reply dated May 5, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed February 13, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1- 43 are allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner and early allowance of these claims and the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP

Dated: May 5, 2004

By Timothy W. Lokse

Timothy W. Lokse
Reg. No. 35,255
Attorney for Applicant

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 833-2055
Gray Cary\EM\7164441.1
2503140-991100